

## BISHOP'S ITCHINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

### Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting 19 January 2026 – 7.30pm

**Present:**

Cllr N. Thomas (Vice Chairman)  
Cllr Horsman  
Cllr Dugmore  
Cllr J. Thomas

**In Attendance:**

Jill Green - Clerk to the Council

**Absent**

Cllr Burns  
Cllr Kettle (Chairman)  
Cllr Tressler  
Cllr Lamont  
Cllr Gist – SDC  
Cllr Rock - SDC

**Public: 53**

**1. Chairman's Announcements:**

**25/273**

None

**2. Apologies:**

**25/274**

Apologies received and accepted from Cllr Burns, Cllr Kettle (Chairman), Cllr Tressler and Cllr Lamont.

**3. Declarations of Interest:**

**25/275**

None Declared.

**4. Dispensations:**

**25/276**

None required.

**6. Public Forum:**

**25/277**

Nine residents participated in the Public Forum, all providing objection comments regarding the Hybrid Planning application 25/02974/OUT Land North Of Hambridge Road Bishops Itchington. A summary of the main points outlined and discussed is as follows:

Signature.....

- Access to the site is an issue and there is a high level of traffic in the village as it stands.
- Sewage infrastructure will not be able to cope with the requirements of further development and is linked to other neighbouring areas.
- There are regular road closures from Severn Trent on Old Road due to problems with the aging infrastructure.
- Utility infrastructure in this area of the village is old.
- Warwickshire County Highways have been contacted previously to address road subsidence, which had occurred with only a small amount of traffic using the road.
- This is an Outline Application, to establish the principle of development in this area and access to the site. If approved, a follow up will be via a Reserved Matters application where the details of the houses and layout will be provided.
- Not all residents have a driveway on Hambridge Road and there are multiple vehicle households. This necessitates on street parking (on an essentially single-track road), limiting road access, with damage to curbs and vehicles being incurred when large vehicles access the area.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was revised in the last 18 months, below that is the Core Strategy which was adopted in 2016 (scheduled to run 2031). In process now is the South Warwickshire Local Plan (joint plan between Warwick District Council and Stratford-on-Avon District Council). The Neighbourhood Plan was created in 2022 and is considered in date, if under 5 years old.
- The main issue is the Stratford-on-Avon District Council, Five-Year Housing Land Supply (5YHLS) figure, which was previously at 24 years. However, following the recent Bordon Hill enquiry Planning Inspector's decision, this was recalculated and is now 2.74 years based on this new formula. It now excludes numbers where builders had not built out following planning approval. When the 5YHLS figure drops below 5 years the local plan is considered out of date and everything defaults to a "tilted balance" towards favouring sustainable development.
- A holistic approach needs to be taken across all planning applications which affect the village. The area is part of the South Warwickshire Local Plan – Area SG14 (East of Gaydon Group) – this broader area was outlined.
- 150 houses with an estimate of 300 cars, will affect everyone in the village, with routes directly past the play area and school.
- Prior objection from Warwickshire County Highways for holiday site application in 2018 (in the same location), for a much lower property size. Access and speed tests were cited within the objection, and this can be referred to within responses (NPPF Paragraph 111 referenced in relation to this).
- The impact of the Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) from the current two-tier system of district and county councils was discussed, however it is beyond the scope of this Planning Application.

The Parish Council response will be posted on the E-Planning portal as soon as possible where all responses from all parties are available to view. The Minutes from the meeting will be available on the Parish Council website and also be posted on the Office and Playing Fields Notice Boards. All individuals can make comments with regards to the application on the Stratford-on-Avon District Council E-Planning website and emails can be sent to the SDC Councillors.

Signature.....

<https://apps.stratford.gov.uk/eplanningv2>

**6. Planning Matters:**  
**25/278**

To consider the parish councils response to the following planning application:

- A) 25/02974/OUT**  
**Land North Of Hambridge Road Bishops Itchington**  
Outline application with all matters reserved other than access for the demolition of an agricultural barn and erection of up to 150 dwellings with public open space and associated infrastructure.

**Comments due by: 26 January 2026.**

Cllr Dugmore thanked residents for their comments so far (52) on the Stratford-on-Avon District Council E-Planning website and then outlined the proposed objection to the application as follows:

**Bishop's Itchington Parish Council Proposed Objection.**

The current calculation method paints Stratford District Council as not achieving a five-year housing land supply (5YHLS). While in this case, the "tilted balance" applies, the adverse impacts of this proposal significantly outweigh its benefits.

Notwithstanding the 5YHLS position, the application's numerous conflicts with policies in the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy, Bishop's Itchington Neighbourhood Development plan (BINDP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) render it an **inappropriate and unsustainable development**.

**1. Conflict with the principles of Plan-Led Growth**

- Approving large, unallocated schemes undermines confidence in plan-led development, contrary to **Core Strategy Policy CS.16** and **NPPF paragraph 15**.
- NPPF paragraph 14 gives weight to the BINDP despite the CS being considered out of date, as follows:

*"In situations where the presumption (at paragraph 11d) applies to applications involving the provision of housing, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the neighbourhood plan is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, provided the following apply:*

- a) the neighbourhood plan became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made; and*
- b) the neighbourhood plan contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement (see paragraphs 69-70)."*

For part a) the BINDP was made in February 2023 so this condition is **TRUE**

For part b) The housing requirement of the Core Strategy is already met, nevertheless. the BINDP supports needs-led development within the BUAB, so this condition is **TRUE**

**2. Unsustainable Location**

- The site lies outside the built-up area boundary, extending the village into open countryside.
- Development here would increase reliance on private cars due to limited local employment and public transport, contrary to **Core Strategy Policy CS.15** (Sustainable Development Principles) and **NPPF paragraph 105–106**.

Signature.....

- The site lies outside the BUAB for the village of Bishops Itchington, so constitutes development in open countryside. It fails to meet any of the policy exemptions and, therefore, conflicts with both **Core Strategy Policy AS.10** and **BINDP Policy BINDP1**.

### 3. Transport

- **The Transport Assessment is missing.**
- Car dependency has almost certainly been underestimated
  - o Unsurprisingly, the Residential Travel Plan refers to the importance of cycling as a sustainable mode of transport and notes that, albeit per a ten-year-old DfT report, the majority of personal trips are below 5 miles and *could* be conducted by bicycle. The plan, however, fails to realise that the assumption that they will be so conducted is flawed and unlikely to be true. Cycling accounts for a fraction of the journeys that the plan claims it *could*.
  - o TRICS data has in the past been shown not to reflect reality, underestimating trip generation.
- This is one of **THREE** developments currently live impacting Bishops Itchington and the B4451 and it represents only one third of a total number of proposed new homes.
  - o The data for each of these developments has been gathered without the presence or consideration of the other.
  - o There can be no accurate assessment made of the cumulative impact looking at the data presented by the developer alone as it reflects only a fraction of the likely reality, therefore, any assertion of acceptability is invalid.
- We are already seeing in other recent developments that the SDC Design Requirements SPD minima for parking standards are not adequate – streets are littered with parked cars, rendering them dangerous for vulnerable road users.
- The site access is inadequate
  - o The site is approached from the east via a single-track gated road
  - o The site is approached by narrow estate roads from the west.
  - o The developer proposes to widen Hambridge Road from Poplar Road to the site entrance, presumably by destroying the green verges which represent part of the rural character of the road.
  - o Ladbroke Road to the north is unsuitable for additional traffic being a narrow rural lane.
  - o The overwhelming majority traffic in and out of the development site will come from the B4451 and pass through residential streets including Poplar Road which is exceptionally narrow or Ladbroke Road which runs through the centre of the village past the primary school. This is an unacceptable conflict with **NPPF paragraph 115(d)**
- The planning statement, at paragraph 2.11, refers to the Bishop's Itchington having a "very good" bus service. While "very good" allows a degree of subjectivity, this statement would be considered grossly inaccurate by most residents. This assessment pre-dates the cessation of the subsidised 65 and 66 services, which existed as a condition of the permission for Tesco in Southam and for which funding has expired.

### 4. Infrastructure Capacity

- Bishop's Itchington already faces pressure on school places, GP services, and road capacity.

Signature.....

- The infrastructure problem is not limited to Bishop's Itchington, with the effects of this type of unplanned, unmanaged growth resulting in excessive demand on core services further afield, including overspill to and from other primary and secondary schools.
- No clear mitigation measures are proposed, breaching **Core Strategy Policy CS.18** (Infrastructure).
- Sewage capacity is in question. Severn Trent may be subject to a statutory duty to Provide, however, should such works be necessary, the deliverability of this is unknown and unlikely to be timely, rendering the site ineffective as a remedy to a 5YHLS shortfall.
- The 'tilted balance' cannot override fundamental infrastructure deficits.

## 5. Landscape and Character Harm

- The proposal would erode the distinct rural edge of Bishop's Itchington, harming the landscape setting and conflicts with **Core Strategy Policy CS.5** (Landscape) and **Core Strategy Policy CS.9** (Design and Distinctiveness).

- Recent planning precedent confirms this to be a location where development will cause significant harm to the landscape and character of the area.

o 24/02516/FUL was refused by SDC. The subsequent appeal was dismissed on 13<sup>th</sup> August 2025, where the Inspector upheld the District Council's reasons for refusal, namely that the development had an **unacceptable effect on the character and the appearance of the countryside and landscape**.

o The inspector noted that *"The proposed structures and works would be inappropriate given the contribution of the site to the rural landscape character, and to people's experience of the countryside. The scheme would conflict with **Core Strategy Policies CS.5 and CS10 and Policy BINDP5 of the Neighbourhood Development Plan**, which seek to protect the landscape and the character of the countryside."*

o The effect of this development on the **same landscape** would be significantly greater.

## 6. Biodiversity and Environmental Sustainability

- Development risks loss of hedgerows, wildlife corridors, and farmland habitats and is in conflict with **Core Strategy Policy CS.6** (Natural Environment) and **NPPF paragraph 174**, which require developments to safeguard or improve biodiversity.

• BIPC seeks a **CONDITION** that EV Charging provision shall be a fully installed and commissioned charging unit per household, of not less than 7 KW capacity with a tethered or untethered type 2 charging connector in accordance with the objectives of **BINDP Policy BINDP12**. It shall have the requisite smart capabilities to support intelligent tariffs, enabling maximum grid balancing capability and cost saving opportunity to the user.

- BIPC seeks measures to require that, as a **MINIMUM**, the LZCT proposals made in the Energy and Sustainability report are provided in 100% of properties, per the objectives of **BINDP Policy BINDP4(e)**.

Signature.....

- Though the Design and Access Statement mentions it, it is disappointing to note that Solar PV appears to have been rejected by the sustainability report citing the capital cost as a disadvantage, despite recognising the carbon savings, potential for self-consumption and export, and low maintenance. Even with a Coefficient of Performance (COP) of over 3, sourcing the energy to run an ASHP from solar PV is advantageous minimising the properties' dependency on grid power.

A decision not to fit solar PV is in the interests of no-one but the developer's finances. BIPC seeks a clarifying **CONDITION** that secures the installation of solar PV and, at least, the provision for domestic battery storage for each dwelling unit, also per the objectives of **BINDP Policy BINDP4(e)**.

## 7. Cumulative Impact

- Bishop's Itchington has already absorbed excessive growth in recent years.
- Further expansion of this scale risks unbalancing the settlement hierarchy set out in **Core Strategy Policy CS.15**, undermining sustainable distribution of housing.
- The scale of the development proposed is excessive. Per the developer's Statement of Community Involvement, the BUAB contains 1,098 dwellings. This proposal, therefore increases the size of the principal village by nearly 14%. Such large developments are inconsistent with the character of Bishop's Itchington and in conflict with **BINDP Policy BINPD2**.

## 8. Conclusion

*While housing delivery is important, this proposal is not the right solution. The adverse impacts on sustainability, infrastructure, landscape, and biodiversity clearly outweigh the benefits and present an obvious danger to parts of the village due to improperly quantified traffic growth.*

*The application conflicts with multiple Core Strategy and Neighbourhood Plan policies, and the NPPF, even when considering the housing land supply calculation.*

Councillors thanked Cllr Dugmore for his very comprehensive summary and further discussed this, with the following points highlighted:

- Flooding Impact – Hambridge Road, prior subsidence issues and flooding on road. 45% development over existing fields will create additional run off which could affect surrounding areas.
- Communication with residents has been poor via a leaflet and online comments.
- Large amounts of documentation quoting requirements with little fulfilment detail. Corporate standard approach used.
- Community asset cited within the documents highlights an already existing pond area.
- Housing mix requires 35% affordable housing, but this depends upon the final application. A housing needs survey is still in date from Warwickshire Rural Community Council and this did not highlight this level of requirement (only 10-14 properties).
- Warwickshire County Highways technical assessment – mentions the widening of Hambridge Road. The only way to do this would be to use the grass verges. Some of the area is owned by Orbit which would restrict widening of the whole area. There is

Signature.....

no discussion within the documentation with regards to the junction and access to Poplar Road and Old Road, which are effectively single-track roads (due to parking) with limited visibility.

- Sustainability – no mention of solar panels.

It was **PROPOSED** to place an objection to this planning application based upon the outline presented by Cllr Dugmore with the additional comments raised regarding;

- Flooding Impact
- Strengthen Design of Access Statement
- Transport Assessment - data required

It was **RESOLVED** to submit an objection on this basis. Proposed Cllr Dugmore, seconded Cllr Horsman – all in favour.

Cllr N. Thomas thanked residents for attending and this part of the meeting concluded at 8.32pm.

#### 7. **Exclusion of Public & Press:**

**25/279** - Confidential matters - , It was **RESOLVED** to exclude the public under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 – Schedule 12A – Part 1 (1). Proposed Cllr N. Thomas, seconded Cllr J. Thomas, all in favour.

1. Appointment of General Maintenance Person - to review the comments of the interview team and to agree on the appointment.

The interview panel reported that they interviewed 2 applicants for the position of General Maintenance Person on Friday 9 January 2025. The Interview panel consisted of Cllr Horsman, Cllr J. Thomas and Cllr N. Thomas and Councillors provided an update on the process applied (including a scoring system), the skills of each candidate and the preferred candidate proposed. All documentation had been provided to Councillors in advance of the meeting. It was **RESOLVED** to accept the feedback from the interview panel and offer the position of General Maintenance Person to Tony Green at the rate of pay discussed. Proposed Cllr Horsman, seconded Cllr J Thomas, all in favour.

Due to the skill set of the second candidate, Councillors asked that this person be considered as an available contractor for future activities and quotations.

#### 8. **Date of Next Meeting:** **25/280**

The next ordinary meeting of the parish council will take place on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026 at 7.30pm at the Community Centre.

#### 9. **Close of Meeting:** **25/281**

The meeting closed at 8.56pm.

Signature.....

Signed.....Chairman Date.....

DRAFT

Signature.....